Yee & Associates, P.C.

4100 Alpha Road
Suite 1100
Dallas, Texas 75244

Main No. (972) 385-8777
Facsimile (972) 385-7766

Facsimile Cover Sheet

To: Commissioner for Patents for **Examiner Peter J. Smith** **Group Art Unit 2176**	Facsimile No.: **571/273-8300**
From: Michele Morrow Legal Assistant to Francis Lammes	No. of Pages Including Cover Sheet: **51**

Message:

Enclosed herewith:

- Transmittal Document; and
- Appeal Brief.

Re: Application No. **09/579,256**
Attorney Docket No: **AUS000195US1**

Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2005

Please contact us at (972) 385-8777 if you do not receive all pages indicated above or experience any difficulty in receiving this facsimile.

PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS TRANSMISSION BY FAXING A CONFIRMATION TO 972-385-7766.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 13 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Khatwani et al.**

Serial No.: **09/579,256**

Filed: **May 25, 2000**

For: **Method and System for Incorporation of Graphical Print Techniques in a Web Browser**

35525
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Group Art Unit: **2176**

Examiner: **Smith, Peter J.**

Attorney Docket No.: **AUS000195US1**

Certificate of Transmission Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)
I hereby certify this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on September 13, 2005.

By: Michele Morrow
Michele Morrow

TRANSMITTAL DOCUMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:
ENCLOSED HEREWITH:

- Appeal Brief (37 C.F.R. 41.37).

A fee of $500.00 is required for filing an Appeal Brief. Please charge this fee to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No additional fees are believed to be necessary. If, however, any additional fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis Lammes
Registration No. 55,353
Agent for Applicants

Duke W. Yee
Registration No. 34,285
Attorney for Applicants

YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 385-8777

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 13 2005

Docket No. AUS000195US1 ***PATENT***

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Khatwani et al.**

Serial No. **09/579,256**

Filed: **May 25, 2000**

For: **Method and System for Incorporation of Graphical Print Techniques in a Web Browser**

§ Group Art Unit: **2176**

§ Examiner: **Smith, Peter J.**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Certificate of Transmission Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)
I hereby certify this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on September 13, 2005.

By: Michele Morrow
Michele Morrow

APPEAL BRIEF (37 C.F.R. 41.37)

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on July 19, 2005.

The fees required under § 41.20(B)(2), and any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefore, are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

09/14/2005 SSITHIB1 00000009 090447 09579256
01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is the following party: International Business Machines Corporation.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

With respect to other appeals or interferences that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal, there are no such appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

A. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

Claims in the application are: 1-7, 9-17, 19-25, 27-37, and 39-70.

B. STATUS OF ALL THE CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

1. Claims canceled: 8, 18, 26, and 38.
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: NONE.
3. Claims pending: 1-7, 9-17, 19-25, 27-37, and 39-70.
4. Claims allowed: NONE.
5. Claims rejected: 1-7, 9-17, 19-25, 27-37, and 39-70.
6. Claims objected to: NONE.

C. CLAIMS ON APPEAL

The claims on appeal are: 1-7, 9-17, 19-25, 27-37, and 39-70.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

There are no amendments after the final rejection.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claims 1, 48, and 65:

The present invention provides a method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document. (Specification, page 20, line 26, to page 21, line 3) The present invention receives a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document. (Specification, page 16, line 22, to page 17, line 6) The present invention receives a request to present a selected portion of the first web document. (Specification, page 19, lines 5-16) The present invention identifies formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document. (Specification, page 22, line 27, to page 23, line 2 and page 23, line 6, to page 26, line 10) The present invention creates in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents. (Specification, page 23, lines 2-5) The present invention inserts virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion in response to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion. (Specification, page 27, line 26, to page 28, line 13) The present invention inserts at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion in response to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion. (Specification, page 31, lines 6-21)

The means recited in independent claim 48, as well as dependent claims 49-52, may be data processing hardware within server **104** or clients **108**, **110**, and **112** in **Figure 1** operating under control of software performing the steps described in the specification at page 17, line 7 to page 20, line 25; page 22, line 22, to page 25, line 30; page 27, line 10, to page 29, line 3; and page 30, line 25, to page 31, line 21, or equivalent. A person having ordinary skill in the art would be able to derive computer instructions on a computer readable medium as recited in claim 65 given **Figures 7, 11, 15,** and **18** and the corresponding description at page 17, line 7 to page 20, line 25; page 22, line 22, to page 25, line 30; page 27, line 10, to page 29, line 3; and page 30, line 25, to page 31, line 21, without undue experimentation.

Independent claims 13, 53, and 66:

The present invention provides a method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document. (Specification, page 25, line 31, to page 26, line 10) The present invention receives a first web document. (Specification, page 16, line 22, to page 17, line 6) The present invention receives a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document. (Specification, page 19, lines 17-29) The present invention creates in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute, within the second web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents. (Specification, page 27, line 10, to page 29, line 3)

The means recited in independent claim 53, as well as dependent claims 54-59, may be data processing hardware within server **104** or clients **108**, **110**, and **112** in **Figure 1** operating under control of software performing the steps described in the specification at page 17, line 7 to page 20, line 25 and page 27, line 10, to page 29, line 3, or equivalent. A person having ordinary skill in the art would be able to derive computer instructions on a computer readable medium as recited in claim 66 given **Figures 7** and **15** and the corresponding description at page 17, line 7 to page 20, line 25 and page 27, line 10, to page 29, line 3, without undue experimentation.

Independent claims 32, 60, and 67:

The present invention provides a method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document. (Specification, page 29, lines 4-16) The present invention receives a first web document. (Specification, page 16, line 22, to page 17, line 6) The present invention receives a request to display page break indicators within the first web document. (Specification, page 20, lines 7-15) The present invention identifies page break information for the first web document for an output device. (Specification, page 30, lines 25-30) The present invention creates in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document, in response to the

page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents. (Specification, page 30, line 30, to page 31, line 21)

The means recited in independent claim 60, as well as dependent claims 61-63, may be data processing hardware within server **104** or clients **108**, **110**, and **112** in **Figure 1** operating under control of software performing the steps described in the specification at page 17, line 7 to page 20, line 25 and page 30, line 25, to page 31, line 21, or equivalent. A person having ordinary skill in the art would be able to derive computer instructions on a computer readable medium as recited in claim 67 given **Figures 7** and **18** and the corresponding description at page 17, line 7 to page 20, line 25 and page 30, line 25, to page 31, line 21, without undue experimentation.

Independent claims 47, 64, 68, and 69:

The present invention provides a method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document. (Specification, page 20, line 26, to page 21, line 3) The present invention receives a first web document. (Specification, page 16, line 22, to page 17, line 6) The present invention receives a request to perform an action, wherein the request to perform an action comprises one of a request to present a selected portion of the first web document, a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and a request to display page break indicators within the first web document. (Specification, page 19, line 5, to page 20, line 15) The present invention creates in the web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents. (Specification, page 23, lines 2-5)

The means recited in independent claim 64 may be data processing hardware within server **104** or clients **108**, **110**, and **112** in **Figure 1** operating under control of software performing the steps described in the specification at page 17, line 7 to page 20, line 25; page 22, line 22, to page 25, line 30; page 27, line 10, to page 29, line 3; and page 30, line 25, to page 31, line 21, or equivalent. A person having ordinary skill in the art would be able to derive computer instructions on a computer readable medium as recited in claim 68 given **Figures 7**, **11**, **15**, and

18 and the corresponding description at page 17, line 7 to page 20, line 25; page 22, line 22, to page 25, line 30; page 27, line 10, to page 29, line 3; and page 30, line 25, to page 31, line 21, without undue experimentation. The system recited in claim 61 may be a bus system comprised of system bus 212; I/O adapter 218; communication adapter 234, memory comprised of read only memory 216 and random access memory 214, and central processing unit 210 of Figure 2 performing the steps described in the specification at page 17, line 7 to page 20, line 25; page 22, line 22, to page 25, line 30; page 27, line 10, to page 29, line 3; and page 30, line 25, to page 31, line 21, or equivalent.

Independent claim 70:

The present invention provides a computer system having stored therein a web browser application. (Specification, page 13, lines 14-23) The present invention provides interface means for allowing the user to interface with the web browser application. (Specification, page 13, lines 24-28) The present invention provides communication means for receiving a first web document form a network. (Specification, page 14, lines 5-11) The present invention provides creation and editing means for creating a second web document. (Specification, page 14, lines 12-22) Wherein the creation and editing means has a plurality of modes of operation includes: a first mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from the interface means to present a selected portion of the first web document, identifies formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document, and creates in the web browser a second web document consisting of the selected portion and the associated formatting information in response to receiving the request, (Specification, page 22, line 22, to page 25, line 30) a second mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from the interface means to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and creates in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute of the selected portion within the second web document is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion, (Specification, page 27, line 10, to page 29, line 3) and a third mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from the interface means to display page break indicators within the first web

document, identifies page break information corresponding to the first web document, and creates in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents (Specification, page 30, line 25 to page 31, line 2).

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A. GROUND OF REJECTION (Claims 1-4, 9-12, 48-50, and 65)

Claims 1-4, 9-12, 48-50, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1) and Nehab et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,182).

B. GROUND OF REJECTION (Claims 5 and 51)

Claims 5 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1) and Nehab et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,182) and further in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,577 B1).

C. GROUND OF REJECTION (Claims 13-17, 19-25, 27-31, 53-59, and 66)

Claims 13-17, 19-25, 27-31, 53-59, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1) and Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,577 B1).

D. GROUND OF REJECTION (Claims 7 and 52)

Claims 7 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1) and Nehab et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,182), and further in view of Michelman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,567 B1).

E. GROUND OF REJECTION (Claims 32-37, 39-46, 60-63, and 67)

Claims 32-37, 39-46, 60-63, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1) and Michelman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,567 B1).

F. GROUND OF REJECTION (Claim 6)

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1), Nehab et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,182), and further in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,577 B1) and Michelman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,567 B1).

G. GROUND OF REJECTION (Claims 47, 64, and 68-70)

Claims 47, 64, and 68-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1), Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,577 B1) and Michelman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,567 B1).

ARGUMENT

A. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 1-4, 9-12, 48-50 and 65

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 9-12, 48-50 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1) and Nehab et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,182). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claim 1 the Office Action states:

> **Regarding independent claim 1,** IBM Research Disclosure teaches receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document in page 688. IBM Research Disclosure teaches receiving a request to obtain a selected portion of the document in fig. 4 and pages 689-690. IBM Research Disclosure teaches a print preview feature in page 688 which generates another representation of the document from the selected portion.
>
> IBM research disclosure does not teach creating a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving a request, wherein the first web document and second web document are markup language documents. Tsimelzon does teach creating a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving a request, wherein the first web document and second web document are markup language documents in fig. 3-4, col. 5 lines 15-16, and col. 5 line 37 – col. 6 line 15.
>
> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tsimelzon into IBM Research Disclosure to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the teaching of Tsimelzon to have enhanced the print preview of IBM Research Disclosure so that the preview could have been editable by the user without affecting the original web page.
>
> IBM Research disclosure does not teach responsive to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion, inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion and responsive to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion, inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion. Nehab does teach responsive to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion, inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion and responsive to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion, inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion in col. 4 lines 13-25, col. 6 line 63 to col. 7 line 2, col.

> 10 lines 7-13, col. 12 line 66 to col.13 line 12, col. 13 lines 21-26. Nehab's teaching of font and break options in the customized document allows the user to have control of how to manipulate the selected data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the teachings of Tsimelzon and Nehab to have modified the IBM Research Disclosure to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the teaching of creating a shortpage in Tsimelzon and the font and break formatting options taught by Nehab to have improved IBM Research Disclosure so that a personalized document containing a portion of the information of the original document as is taught by Nehab col. 4 lines 13-25. Tsimelzon teaches in col. 11line 11-20 that the shortpage web document may be edited and modified. Therefore, the one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the shortpage using the format modification teachings of Nehab.

Office Action dated April 19, 2005, pages 2-4.

Claim 1, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 48 and 65 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

> 1. A method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document, the method comprising:
>
> receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document;
>
> receiving a request to present a selected portion of the first web document;
>
> identifying formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document;
>
> creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents;
>
> responsive to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion, inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion; and
>
> responsive to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion, inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion.

IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, and Nehab, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest responsive to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion, inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion and responsive to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion, inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion.

The Office Action acknowledges that the first reference, IBM Research Disclosure, does not teach "responsive to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion, inserting

virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion and responsive to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion, inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion." However, the Office Action dated September 28, 2004 alleges that a second reference, Tsimelzon, teaches these features. Appellants respectfully submit that Tsimelzon fails to teach or suggest inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion of a web document in response to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion of a web document or inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion of a web document in response to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion of a web document. Web documents are intended to provide information to a user and not to have the contents within the web document edited by changing font size. This is evident in the teachings of the IBM Research Disclosure and Tsimelzon, as nowhere in either reference is the editing of font within a web page or HTML document taught or suggested.

The Final Office Action dated April 19, 2005 alleges that a third reference, Nehab, teaches inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion of a web document in response to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion of a web document or inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion of a web document in response to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion of a web document. Appellants respectfully submit that Nehab fails to teach or suggest these features. The Final Office Action alleges that Nehab teaches these features at column 4, lines 13-25; column 6, line 63, to column 7, line 2; column 10, lines 7-13; column 12, line 66, to column 13, line 12; and column 13, lines 21-26, which read as follows:

> In yet another aspect, the invention formats a hypermedia document into a personalized document. A location of the hypermedia document is specified, a type of the hypermedia document is specified, a scope of data to be retrieved from the hypermedia document is specified, wherein the scope is based on a structure of the hypermedia document, and a format is specified for formatting the data retrieved from the hypermedia document into the personalized document. The hypermedia document found at the specified location is accessed, data is retrieved from the hypermedia document in accordance with the specified hypermedia document type and in accordance with the specified scope, and the data is formatted into the personalized document in accordance with the specified format.

(Column 4, lines 13-25)

> Finally, linear document 32 is formatted according to user-specified (or default) formatting instructions into formatted document 33, shown as a stylized personal

> newspaper in FIG. 3D. Formatted document 33 has various fonts and/or colors for site labels, indices/headings, articles, and the like. Furthermore, formatted document 33 is broken down into pages.

(Column 6, line 63, to column 7, line 2)

> In step S517, format editor 39 allows the user to define the font styles for indices/headings, sub-headings, bylines and actual text of news articles. In step S518, format editor 39 prompts the user to define index/heading colors, title colors, etc. In this regard, layout editor 39 is capable of determining the types of fonts and colors available to the user based on the system's printer capabilities.

(Column 10, lines 7-13)

> The second embodiment of the invention is a system for processing a hypermedia document. The system accesses the hypermedia document, extracts addresses from the hypermedia document, and stores the addresses extracted from the hypermedia document in a container. The system activates a processing function to process data stored at the addresses stored in the container, downloads the data stored at the addresses stored in the container into a memory, and extracts predetermined data from downloaded data in accordance with predetermined configuration information. The predetermined data is then formatted in accordance with predefined formatting settings to generate a formatted document, and the formatted document is processed in accordance with the processing function.

(Column 12, line 66, to column 13, line 12)

> WebFormatter is stand-alone utility software that can be used in conjunction with different Web browsers, such as Netscape, Mosaic and Internet Explorer. In short, WebFormatter extracts data from a Web page, strips out extemporaneous data from the extracted data, and reformats the data into a formatted document. The formatted document can then be printed, stored in an RTF (Rich Text Format) file, or edited in any RTF compatible editor, such as MS Word, WordPerfect, Wordpad, etc.

(Column 13, lines 21-30)

In column 4, lines 13-25, Nehab describes retrieving a hypermedia document and presenting the document to a user using a format that is specified for formatting the data retrieved from the hypermedia document into the personalized document. In column 6, line 63 to column 7, line 2, Nehab describes the formatting for the entire presented hypermedia document may be various fonts, colors, indices/headings, articles, and the like. In column 10, line 7-13, Nehab describe allowing the user to define the styles; however, in column 12, line 66 to column 13, line 12, Nehab further describes the styles are stored as predefined formatting settings and each

hypermedia document that is retrieved is presented using these styles. In column 13, lines 21-30, Nehab describes printing or storing the presented document. Nowhere in these sections, or any other sections of Nehab, is there a teaching of suggestion of responsive to a request to change a font attribute of the **selected portion** of a web document, **inserting virtual font indicators** before and after text within the **selected portion** of the web document and responsive to a request to identify a page break in the **selected portion** of the web document, **inserting at least one virtual page break indicator** within the **selected portion** of the web document. Nehab merely presents the entire document in the predefined format setting. Additionally, nowhere in the Nehab reference is there a teaching of **inserting virtual font indicators** or **inserting at least one virtual page break indicator**. If fact, the term "virtual" fails to appear anywhere in the Nehab reference.

Furthermore, there is not so much as a suggestion in any of the three references to modify the references to include such features. That is, there is no teaching or suggestion in the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, or Nehab that a problem exists for which inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion of a web document to change a font attribute or inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion of a web document, is a solution. None of the three references even recognizes a need to change a font attribute **of a selected portion** of a web document by **inserting virtual font indicators** before and after text or inserting virtual page breaks **within a selected portion** of a web document, as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, none of the three references teaches or suggests the desirability of incorporating the subject matter of the other reference. The Final Office Action alleges that the motivation would be so that a personalized document containing a portion of the information of the original document as is taught by Nehab col. 4 lines 13-25. However, as discussed, web documents are intended to provide information to a user and not to have the contents within the web document edited by changing font size, other font attributes or inserting page breaks and Nehab teaches presenting the entire document using predefined format settings. Thus, the only teaching or suggestion to even attempt the alleged combination is based on a prior knowledge of Appellants' claimed invention thereby constituting impermissible hindsight reconstruction using Appellants' own disclosure as a guide.

One of ordinary skill in the art, being presented only with IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, and Nehab, and without having a prior knowledge of Appellants' claimed invention, would not have found it obvious to combine and modify IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, and Nehab to arrive at Appellants' claimed invention. To the contrary, even if one were somehow motivated to combine IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, and Nehab, and it were somehow possible to combine the systems, the result would not be the invention, as recited in claim 1. The resulting system still would not **insert virtual font indicators** before and after text within the **selected portion** of a web document in response to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion or **insert at least one virtual page break indicator** within the selected portion of a web document in response to a request to identify a page break in the **selected portion** within a web document.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, and Nehab, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 48, and 65. At least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 48, the features of dependent claims 2-4, 9-12, and 49-50 are not taught or suggested in the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, and Nehab, whether taken individually or in combination. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-4, 9-12, 48-50 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) not be sustained.

B. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 5 and 51

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1) and Nehab et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,182) and further in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,577 B1).

The deficiencies of the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, and Nehab have been addressed above. That is, the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, and Nehab fail to teach or suggest inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion of a web

document in response to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion of a web document; however, the Office Action alleges that a fourth reference, Kim, teaches this feature.

Kim is directed to a method for displaying font information by using a font preview window, when the user makes up a document, the sample of the desirable font is promptly shown to the user through the font preview window. While Kim may teach changing fonts in a document, Kim does not teach or suggest inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion **of a web document** in response to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion **of a web document**. Web documents are intended to provide information to a user and not to have the contents within the web document edited by changing font size. This is evident in the teachings of Kim, as nowhere in the Kim reference is the editing of font within a web page or HTML document taught or suggested. Thus, Kim does not provide for the deficiencies of the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, and Nehab. In that, Kim does not teach or suggest **inserting virtual font indicators** before and after text **within the selected portion of a web document** in response to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion **of a web document**.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, Nehab, and Kim, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 1 and 48. At least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 48, the features of dependent claims 5 and 51 are not taught or suggested in the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, Nehab, and Kim, whether taken individually or in combination. Accordingly, Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) not be sustained.

C. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 13-17, 19-25, 27-31, 53-59, and 66

The Office Action rejects claims 13-17, 19-25, 27-31, 53-59 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1) and Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,577 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claim 13 the Office Action states:

> **Regarding independent claim 13**, IBM Research Disclosure teaches receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document in page 688. IBM Research Disclosure teaches receiving a request to obtain a selected portion of the document in fig. 4 and pages 689-690. IBM Research Disclosure teaches a print preview feature in page 688 which generates another representation of the document from the selected portion.
>
> IBM research disclosure does not teach creating a second web document including the second portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving a request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents. Tsimelzon does teach creating a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving a request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents in fig. 3-4, col.5 lines 15-16, and col. 5, line 37 to col. 6 lines 15.
>
> It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tsimelzon into IBM Research Disclosure to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the teaching of Tsimelzon to have enhanced the print preview of IBM Research Doucment so that the preview could have been editeable by the user without affecting the original web page.
>
> IBM Research Disclosure does not teach modifying the font attribute of a selected portion of a web document. Kim teaches modifying the font attribute of a selected portion of a document in fig. 4-5, 8, and the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tsimelzon and Kim into IBM Research Disclosure to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have allowed for the changing of the font so that the user could have modified the selected portion of the web page so that it would have been more legible when outputted to the display or printer.

Office Action dated April 19, 2005, pages 10-11.

Claim 13, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 53 and 66 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

> 13. A method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document, said method comprising:
>
> receiving a first web document;
>
> receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document; and
>
> creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute, within the second web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font

attribute of the selected portion, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents..

Appellants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon and Kim, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion in response to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion of a web document. The deficiencies of the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, and Kim have been addressed above. That is, the IBM Research Disclosure and Tsimelzon fail to teach or suggest inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion of a web document in response to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion of a web document.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon and Kim, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 13, 53, and 66. At least by virtue of their dependency on claims 13 and 53, the features of dependent claims 14-17, 19-25, 27-31, and 54-59 are not taught or suggested in the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon and Kim, whether taken individually or in combination. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 13-17, 19-25, 27-31, 53-59, and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) not be sustained.

Moreover, in addition to their dependency from independent claims 13 and 53, the features of dependent claims 14-17, 19-25, 27-31, and 54-59 are not taught or suggested by the alleged combination of the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon and Kim, taken individually or in combination. For example, with regard to claims 14 and 54, the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon and Kim, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest where the step of creating the second web document includes **inserting virtual font indicators** before and after text within the selected portion. As shown above, the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon and Kim, taken alone or in combination, fail to teaches or suggest changing any font attributes within web documents. Thus, it follows that the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon and Kim, taken alone or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest the features as recited in claims 14 and 54.

Therefore, in addition to being dependent on independent claims 13 and 53, dependent claims 14-17, 19-25, 27-31, and 54-59 are also distinguishable over the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon and Kim by virtue of the specific features recited in these claims.

Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 14-17, 19-25, 27-31, and 54-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) not be sustained.

D. **35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 7 and 52**

The Office Action rejects claims 7 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1) and Nehab et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,182) and further in view of Michelman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,567 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7 and 52 are dependent on independent claims 1 and 48 and, thus, these claims distinguish over the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, and Nehab for at least the reasons noted above with regards to claims 1 and 48. Moreover, the fourth reference, Michelman, does not provide for the deficiencies of the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, and Nehab and, thus, any alleged combination of the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, Nehab, and Michelman would not be sufficient to reject independent claims 1 and 48 or claims 7 and 52 by virtue of their dependency. That is, Michelman does not teach or suggest **inserting virtual font indicators** before and after text within the selected portion **of a web document** in response to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion **of a web document**.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Nehab and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 1 and 48. At least by virtue of its dependency on claims 1 and 48, the features of dependent claims 7 and 52 are not taught or suggested in the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Nehab and Michelman, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) not be sustained.

E. **35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 32-37, 39-46, 60-63, and 67**

The Office Action rejects claims 32-37, 39-46, 60-63, and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1) and Michelman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,567 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claim 32, the Office Action states:

> Regarding independent claim 32, IBM Research Disclosure does not teach inserting additional page breaks indicators into a web document. Michelman does teach manipulating page breaks and page break indicators in a document in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the IBM Research Document so that the page margins and page breaks indicators could have been modified after the initial frame selection setting up the page breaks for the initial page. It would have been obvious and desirable to have implemented this combination so that the user could have further control in preparing the display of the selected portion of the document for output to either a display or a printer.

Office Action dated April 19, 2005, page 23.

Claim 32, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 60 and 67 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

> 32. A method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document, the method comprising:
> receiving a first web document;
> receiving a request to display page break indicators within the first web document;
> identifying page break information for the first web document for an output device; and
> creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

Appellants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest where at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document. The Office Action acknowledges that the IBM Research Document fails to teach "inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within

the selected portion of a web document in response to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion of a web document." Appellants respectfully submit that Tsimelzon also fails to teach or suggest these features, as discussed above. However, the Office Action alleges that a third reference, Michelman, teaches these features.

Michelman does not provide for the deficiencies of the IBM Research Disclosure and Tsimelzon. That is, Michelman does not teach or suggest where at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document. Michelman is directed to a system for manipulating page-breaks in an electronic document. A user interface process provides a graphical user interface allowing a user to select a page-break within an electronic document and then identify a new location for the page-break. A system process performs the steps of moving the selected page-break to the new location and adjusting the scaling and the automatic page-breaks for the remainder of the document to accommodate the page-break at the new location. Nowhere, in the Michelman reference are page break indicators inserted into a web document. Web documents are intended to provide information to a user and not to have the contents within the web document edited by inserting page break indicators. This is evident in the teachings of the IBM Research Disclosure and Tsimelzon, as nowhere in either reference is inserting page break indicators within a web page or HTML document taught or suggested. While, Michelman may teach selecting page breaks within an electronic document, Michelman does not teach or suggest **inserting a virtual page break** indicator into **a web document**. Any conclusion that it would have been obvious to include a second web document in the system of Michelman must be based entirely on a hindsight reconstruction of Appellants' claimed invention having first had benefit of Appellants' disclosure. However, even if the references were combinable and there were a suggestion to combine them in the manner alleged by the Office Action, the result would not be the claimed invention because none of the references teaches the features emphasized above with regard to independent claims 32, 60, and 67.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 32, 60 and 67. At least by virtue of its dependency on claims 32 and 60, the specific features of dependent claims 33-37, 39-46, and 61-63 are not taught or suggested in the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, and Michelman, whether taken alone or in combination.

Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 32-37, 39-46, 60-63, and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) not be sustained.

F. **35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claim 6**

The Office Action rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1) and Nehab et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,182), and further in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,577 B1) and Michelman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,567 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 is dependent on independent claim 1 and, thus, this claim distinguishes over the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, Nehab, and Kim for at least the reasons noted above with regards to claims 1 and 5. Moreover, the fifth applied reference, Michelman, does not provide for the deficiencies of the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, Nehab, and Kim and, thus, any alleged combination of the IBM Research Document, Tsimelzon, Nehab, Kim, and Michelman would not be sufficient to reject claim 1 and 5 or claim 6 by virtue of its dependency. That is, Michelman does not teach or suggest inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion in response to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Nehab, Kim, and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claim 1. At least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1, the features of dependent claim 6 is not taught or suggested in the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Nehab, Kim, and Michelman, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) not be sustained.

G. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 47, 64, and 68-70

The Office Action rejects claims 47, 64, and 68-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Page Frame Feature for Printing Electronic Documents*; International Business Machines Research Disclosure; May 1999, pages 688-690 in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388 B1), Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,577 B1) and Michelman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,567 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

G.1. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 47, 64, 68, and 69

As to claims 47, 64, 68, and 69, the Office Action states:

> **Regarding independent claim 47**, IBM Research Disclosure does not teach modifying the font attribute of a selected portion of a web document. Kim teaches modifying the font attribute of a selected portion of a document in fig. 4-5, 8, and the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tsimelzon and Kim into IBM Research Disclosure to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have allowed for the changing of the font so that the user could have modified the selected portion of the web page so that it would have been more legible when outputted to the display or printer.
>
> IBM Research Disclosure does not teach inserting additional page breaks indicators into a web document. Michelman does teach manipulating page breaks and page break indicators in a document in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the IBM Research Disclosure so that the page margins and page breaks indicators could have been modified after the initial frame selection setting up the page breaks for the initial page. It would have been obvious and desirable to have implemented this combination so that the user could have had further control in preparing the display of the selected portion of the document for output to either a display or a printer.

Office Action dated April 19, 2005, pages 29-30.

Claim 47, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 64, 68 and 69 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

> 47. A method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document, the method comprising:
>
> receiving a first web document;

receiving a request to perform an action, wherein the request to perform an action comprises one of a request to present a selected portion of the first web document, a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and a request to display page break indicators within the first web document; and

creating in the web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

Appellants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Kim and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document.

The deficiencies of the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Kim, and Michelman are addressed above. That is, the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Nehab, Kim, and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest **inserting virtual font indicators** before and after text **within the selected portion of a web document** in response to a request to change a font attribute **of the selected portion of a web document** or **inserting at least one virtual page break indicator** within the **selected portion of a web document** in response to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion **of a web document**. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the references to **provide these features**. Any conclusion that it would have been obvious to insert virtual font indicators or insert a virtual page break indicator **within a web document** in the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Kim, or Michelman must be based entirely on a hindsight reconstruction of Appellants' claimed invention having first had benefit of Appellants' disclosure. However, even if the references were combinable and there were a suggestion to combine them in the manner alleged by the Office Action, the result would not be the claimed invention because none of the references teaches or suggest changing font attributes or inserting a virtual page break indicator **within a web document** as recited in independent claims 47, 64, 68, and 69.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Kim, and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 47, 64, 68 and 69. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 47, 64, 68, and 69 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) not be sustained.

G.2. **35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claim 70**

Claim 70, reads as follows:

70. A computer system having stored therein a web browser application, the system comprising:

interface means for allowing the user to interface with the web browser application;

communication means for receiving a first web document form a network;

creation and editing means for creating a second web document, wherein the creation and editing means has a plurality of modes of operation including:

a first mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from the interface means to present a selected portion of the first web document, identifies formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document, and creates in the web browser a second web document consisting of the selected portion and the associated formatting information in response to receiving the request;

a second mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from the interface means to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and creates in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute of the selected portion within the second web document is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion; and

a third mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from the interface means to display page break indicators within the first web document, identifies page break information corresponding to the first web document, and creates in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

Appellants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Kim, and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest **inserting virtual font indicators** before and after text **within the selected portion of a web document** in response to a request to change a font attribute **of the selected portion of a web document** or **inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion of a web document** in response to a request to identify a page break in the **selected portion of a web document**. The deficiencies of the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Kim, and Michelman are addressed

above. That is, the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Kim, and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest inserting virtual font indicators or inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion of a web document. Any conclusion that it would have been obvious to include these features in the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Kim, or Michelman must be based entirely on a hindsight reconstruction of Appellants' claimed invention having first had benefit of Appellants' disclosure. However, even if the references were combinable and there were a suggestion to combine them in the manner alleged by the Office Action, the result would not be the claimed invention because none of the references teaches or suggest inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion of a web document in response to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion of a web document or inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion of a web document in response to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion of a web document as recited in independent claim 70.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that the IBM Research Disclosure, Tsimelzon, Kim, and Michelman, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claim 70. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) not be sustained.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-25, 27-37, and 39-70 are allowable over the cited prior art and that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to not sustain the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action.

Francis Lammes
Reg. No. 55,353
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
PO Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777

CLAIMS APPENDIX

The text of the claims involved in the appeal are:

1. A method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document, the method comprising:

receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document;

receiving a request to present a selected portion of the first web document;

identifying formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document;

creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents;

responsive to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion, inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion; and

responsive to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion, inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion.

2. The method of claim 1, further comprising sending the second web document to an output device.

3. The method of claim 2, wherein the output device is a printer.

4. The method of claim 2, wherein the output device is a display device.

5. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the second web document; and

creating in the web browser a third web document from the second web document, wherein the font attribute, within the third web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion.

6. The method of claim 5, further comprising:

receiving a request to display page break indicators within the third web document;

identifying page break information for the third web document for an output device; and

creating in the web browser a fourth web document from the third web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the fourth web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks.

7. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

receiving a request to display page break indicators within the second web document;

identifying page break information for the second web document for an output device; and

creating in the web browser a third web document from the second web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the third web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks.

9. The method of claim 1, wherein the formatting information includes tags.

10. The method of claim 1, wherein the markup language is hypertext markup language.

11. The method of claim 10, wherein the formatting information includes hypertext markup language tags.

12. The method of claim 10, wherein the formatting information includes a header.

13. A method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document, said method comprising:

receiving a first web document;

receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document; and

creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute, within the second web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

14. The method of claim 13, wherein the step of creating the second web document includes inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion.

15. The method of claim 14, further comprising sending the second web document to an output device.

16. The method of claim 15, wherein the output device is a display device, the selected portion being displayed according to the virtual font indicators.

17. The method of claim 15, wherein the output device is a printer, the selected portion being printed according to the virtual font indicators.

19. The method of claim 14, wherein the virtual font indicators include tags.

20. The method of claim 14, wherein the markup language is hypertext markup language.

21. The method of claim 20, wherein the virtual font indicators include hypertext markup language tags.

22. The method of claim 13, further comprising identifying at least one font indicator associated with text within the selected portion of the first web document, wherein the step of creating the second web document includes modifying the font attribute of the associated at least one font indicator.

23. The method of claim 22, further comprising sending the second web document to an output device.

24. The method of claim 23, wherein the output device is a display device, the selected portion being displayed according to the modified at least one font indicator.

25. The method of claim 23, wherein the output device is a printer, the selected portion being printed according to the modified at least one font indicator.

27. The method of claim 22, wherein the at least one font indicator includes a tag.

28. The method of claim 22, wherein the markup language is hypertext markup language.

29. The method of claim 28, wherein the at least one font indicator includes a hypertext markup language tag.

30. The method of claim 13, wherein the step of creating the second web document comprises creating a copy of the first web document and changing the font attribute of the selected portion within the copy of the first web document.

31. The method of claim 13, wherein the step of creating the second web document comprises changing the font attribute of the selected portion within the first web document to create the second web document.

32. A method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document, the method comprising:

receiving a first web document;

receiving a request to display page break indicators within the first web document;

identifying page break information for the first web document for an output device; and

creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

33. The method of claim 32, further comprising:

removing the at least one virtual page break indicator; and

printing the second web document.

34. The method of claim 32, further comprising:

replacing the at least one virtual page break indicator with at least one forced page break; and

printing the second web document.

35. The method of claim 32, further comprising sending the second web document to the output device.

36. The method of claim 35, wherein the output device is a printer.

37. The method of claim 35, wherein the output device is a display device.

39. The method of claim 32, wherein the at least one virtual page break indicator includes a tag.

40. The method of claim 32, wherein the markup language is hypertext markup language.

41. The method of claim 40, wherein the at least one virtual page break indicator includes a hypertext markup language tag.

42. The method of claim 32, wherein the step of creating the second web document comprises creating a copy of the first web document and inserting at least one virtual page break indicator into the copy of the first web document.

43. The method of claim 32, wherein the step of creating the second web document comprises inserting the at least one virtual page break indicator into the first web document to create the second web document.

44. The method of claim 32, wherein the step of identifying page break information comprises sending the first web document to a device driver and receiving page break information corresponding to the first web document from the device driver.

45. The method of claim 32, wherein the device driver is a printer driver.

46. The method of claim 32, wherein the step of identifying page break information comprises identifying the location of at least one page break based on page setup information, document formatting information, and document content.

47. A method in a web browser on a data processing system for processing a document, the method comprising:

receiving a first web document;

receiving a request to perform an action, wherein the request to perform an action comprises one of a request to present a selected portion of the first web document, a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and a request to display page break indicators within the first web document; and

creating in the web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

48. An apparatus for processing a document, comprising:

receiving means for receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document;

receiving means for receiving a request to present a selected portion of the first web document;

identifying means for identifying formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document;

creating means for creating in a web browser a second web document consisting of the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents;

responsive to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion, inserting means for inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion; and

responsive to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion, inserting means for inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion.

49. The apparatus of claim 48, further comprising means for displaying the second web document.

50. The apparatus of claim 48, further comprising means for printing the second web document.

51. The apparatus of claim 48, further comprising:

means for receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the second web document; and

means for creating a third web document from the second web document, wherein the font attribute of the selected portion within the third web document is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion.

52. The apparatus of claim 48, further comprising:

means for receiving a request to display page break indicators within the second web document;

means for identifying page break information for the second web document for an output device; and

means for creating a third web document from the second web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the third web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks.

53. An apparatus for processing a document, comprising:

receiving means for receiving a first web document;

receiving means for receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document; and

creating means for creating in a web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute of the selected portion within the second web document is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

54. The apparatus of claim 53, wherein the creating means comprises means for inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion.

55. The apparatus of claim 54, further comprising means for displaying the second web document, the selected portion being displayed according to the virtual font indicators.

56. The apparatus of claim 54, further comprising means for printing the second web document, the selected portion being printed according to the virtual font indicators.

57. The apparatus of claim 53, further comprising means for identifying at least one font indicator associated with text within the selected portion of the first web document, wherein the creating means comprises means for modifying the font attribute of the associated at least one font indicator.

58. The apparatus of claim 57, further comprising means for displaying the second web document, the selected portion being displayed according to the at least one modified font indicator.

59. The apparatus of claim 57 further comprising means for printing the second web document, the selected portion being printed according to the at least one modified font indicator.

60. An apparatus for processing a document, comprising:

receiving means for receiving a first web document;

receiving means for receiving a request to display page break indicators within the first web document;

identifying means for identifying page break information for the first web document for an output device; and

creating means for creating in a web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web

document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

61. The apparatus of claim 60, further comprising:

removing means for removing the at least one virtual page break indicator; and

printing means for printing the second web document.

62. The apparatus of claim 60, further comprising:

replacing means for replacing the at least one virtual page break indicator with at least one forced page break; and

printing means for printing the second web document.

63. The apparatus of claim 60, further comprising means for displaying the second web document.

64. An apparatus for processing a document, comprising:

receiving means for receiving a first web document including a header;

receiving means for receiving a request to perform an action, wherein the request to perform an action comprises one of a request to present a selected portion of the first web document, a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and a request to display page break indicators within the first web document; and

creating means for creating in a web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

65. A computer program product in a computer readable medium for processing a document, the computer program product comprising:

instruction means for receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document;

instruction means for receiving a request to present a selected portion of the first web document;

instruction means for identifying formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document;

instruction means for creating in a web browser a second web document consisting of the selected portion and the associated formatting information in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents;

responsive to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion, instruction means for inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion; and

responsive to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion, instructions for inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion.

66. A computer program product in a computer readable medium for processing a document, the computer program product comprising:

instruction means for receiving a first web document;

instruction means for receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document; and

instruction means for creating in a web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute of the selected portion within the second web document is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

67. A computer program product in a computer readable medium for processing a document, the computer program product comprising:

instruction means for receiving a first web document;

instruction means for receiving a request to display page break indicators within the first web document;

instruction means for identifying page break information corresponding to the first web document; and

instruction means for creating in a web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

68. A computer program product in a computer readable medium for processing a document, the computer program product comprising:

instruction means for receiving a first web document;

instruction means for receiving a request to perform an action, wherein the request to perform an action comprises one of a request to present a selected portion of the first web document, a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and a request to display page break indicators within the first web document; and

instruction means for creating in a web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

69. An apparatus comprising:

a processor;

a memory electrically connected to said processor, the memory having stored therein a program to be executed on said processor for performing the following steps:

receiving a first web document including;

receiving a request to perform an action, wherein the request to perform an action comprises one of a request to present a selected portion of the first web document, a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and a request to display page break indicators within the first web document; and

creating in a web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

70. A computer system having stored therein a web browser application, the system comprising:

interface means for allowing the user to interface with the web browser application;

communication means for receiving a first web document form a network;

creation and editing means for creating a second web document, wherein the creation and editing means has a plurality of modes of operation including:

a first mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from the interface means to present a selected portion of the first web document, identifies formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document, and creates in the web browser a second web document consisting of the selected portion and the associated formatting information in response to receiving the request;

a second mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from the interface means to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document, and creates in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute of the selected portion within the second web document is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion; and

a third mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from the interface means to display page break indicators within the first web document, identifies page break information corresponding to the first web document, and creates in the web browser a second web document from the first web document,

wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no evidence to be presented.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no related proceedings.